



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/719,428

11/21/2003

Vincent J. Zimmer

INTEL/17852

3414

75343 7590 07/11/2008
Hanely Flight & Zimmerman, LLC
150 S. Wacker Drive
Suite 2100
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

SHIFERAW, ELENI A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2136

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/719,428</p>	<p>Applicant(s) ZIMMER ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner ELENI A. SHIFERAW</p>	<p>Art Unit 2136</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 1-32.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Nasser G Moazzami/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2136

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Regarding argument neither CHIM nor Kuznetsov et al. describe/suggest storing a plurality of protection policy descriptors in a resource protection list, wherein each of the protection policy descriptors is indicative of a protection policy for its one of the memory ranges, as recited in claim 1, remark page 11-14 section III, argument is not persuasive because sections 7.2, and 7.2.1-7.2.2.2.3 of discloses a security properties of a platform protection profile (section 1.3.1) and an ACPI table usage and post-boot OS accessing/reading data of ACPI that is stored in a pre-boot environment and instantiation of event log array structures comprising hash within validation certificate for validation, CHIM, and PCR register usage that define PCR assignments used for boot time integrity metrics and methodology for collecting the metrics (section 2.2). Kuznetsov et al. discloses assigning each of the plurality of descriptors to a respective one of a plurality of memory ranges during the pre-book environment, wherein each of the descriptors is indicative of a corresponding protection policy for its one of the memory ranges (see col. 6 lines 20-68, and col. 9 lines 3-col. 10 lines 67), and moreover Kuznetsov discloses a computer security system comprising defined software access privilege (col. 16 lines 39-41; descriptor) in a passive operating mode (col. 17 lines 25-29; pre-boot) that is associated with access rights, comprising software privilege of changing files and privilege of writing, (col. 17 lines 10-19; software protection policy) using protection program support module (fig. 8 element 120B). Sufficient motivation to combine is provided in the office action

Regarding argument remark section IV for claim 11, similar argument is disclosed for similar limitation as section III above, therefore argument is not persuasive because of same reason above in section III.

Regarding argument remark section V for claim 21, similar argument is disclosed for similar limitation as section III above, therefore argument is not persuasive because of same reason above in section III.

Regarding argument remark section VI for claim 31, similar argument is disclosed for similar limitation as section III above, therefore argument is not persuasive because of same reason above in section III.